R E P O R T R E S U M E S

ED 015 975 UD 004 712

THE CONSEQUENCES OF RACIAL ISOLATION IN THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS--ANOTHER LOOK.

BY- PETTIGREW, THOMAS F.

PUB DATE N OV6 70

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.25 HC-$1.20 28F.

DESCRIPTORS- *SCHOOL INTEGRATION, *NEGROES, *ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT, *RACIAL INTEGRATION, *SCHOOL SEGREGATION, INTEGRATION EFFECTS, SOCIAL CLASS, CLASSROOM INTEGRATION, SOCIAL INFLUENCES, COMPENSATORY EDUCATION, TEACHING QUALITY, BIRACIAL SCHOOLS, EQUAL EDUCATION, EDUCATIONAL FACILITIES, PEER ACCEPTANCE, PSYCHOLOGICAL CHARACTERISTICS, U.S. COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS, COLEMAN REPORT

TO EXAMINE THE CONSEQUENCES OF SCHOOL RACIAL ISOLATION, THIS PAPER REVIEWS THE FINDINGS OF TWO RECENT FEDERAL SURVEYS OF PUBLIC SCHOOL SEGREGATION, "RACIAL ISOLATION IN THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS" AND "EQUALITY OF EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY," AS WELL AS DATA FROM SEVERAL OTHER STUDIES. THE MATERIAL IS PRESENTED UNDER THE RUBRICS OF (1) THE CHIEF CORRELATES OF NEGRO ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT, (2) RACIAL COMPOSITION OF THE CLASSROOM AND NEGRO ACHIEVEMENT, (3) USEFUL DEFINITIONS OF SEGREGATION, DESEGREGATION, AND INTEGRATION, (4) THE NONACADEMIC CONSEQUENCES OF INTERRACIAL EDUCATION, AND (5) THE EFFECTIVENESS OF COMPENSATORY EDUCATION IN SEGREGATED SCHOOLS AS A SUBSTITUTE FOR INTEGRATED EDUCATION. THE FINDINGS OF THESE STUDIES SHOW THAT SOCIAL CLASS IS THE MOST IMPORTANT SCHOOL CORRELATE OF ACHIEVEMENT TEST SCORES. ALSO TEACHER QUALITY IS A MORE SIGNIFICANT FACTOR IN STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT THAN SCHOOL FACILITIES, AND THE RACIAL COMPOSITION OF THE SCHOOL AND CLASSROOM HAS AN ACADEMIC AND PSYCHOSOCIAL EFFECT ON STUDENTS. INTEGRATED EDUCATION, WHICH OCCURS IN DESEGREGATED SCHOOLS WHERE THERE IS INTERRACIAL ACCEPTANCE, IS MOST BENEFICIAL WHEN BEGUN IN THE EARLIEST PRIMARY GRADES. FINALLY, COMPENSATORY SEGREGATED EDUCATION IS NOT AN EFFECTIVE SUBSTITUTE FOR INTEGRATED SCHOOLS AND DOES NOT RESULT IN LASTING ACADEMIC IMPROVEMENT FOR NEGROES. THIS PAPER WAS PREPARED FOR THE NATIONAL CONFERENCE ON EQUAL EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY IN AMERICA'S CITIES, SPONSORED BY THE U.S. COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS, WASHINGTON, D.C., NOVEMBER 16-18, 1967. (NH)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

04712

ED015975

THE CONSEQUENCES OF RACIAL ISOLATION IN THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS:

ANOTHER LOOK

Prepared by
Thomas F. Pettigrew
Harvard University
for the
National Conference on Equal Educational Opportunity
in America's Cities
National Conference on Race and Education
sponsored by the
U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, Washington, D.C.
November 16-18, 1967

Suppose the racial isolation and segregation of America's public schools had no seriously negative effects upon either Negro or white children. If this were true,, the increasing pattern of so-called de facto racial segregation of public education throughout the nation need not concern us. Indeed, there would be little need for this Conference. Thus, Chapter Three, entitled "Racial Isolation and the Outcomes of Education," of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights' report on Racial Isolation in the Public Schools assumes special importance and deserves another look.[1]

UD 004 712

I. The Chief Correlates of Negro Academic Achievement

To evaluate adequately the academic consequences for Negro American children of racial isolation, the findings must be placed in the context of the chief correlates in general of Negro student achievement. Such a context is provided by the much-discussed and often-misinterpreted Coleman Report.[2] Called for by Congress in Title IV of the 1964 Civil Rights Act and supervised by the U. S. Office of Education, this massive study of Equality of Educational Opportunity tested over 600,000 children and thousands of teachers and school administrators throughout the country. No short summary of James Coleman's survey can do justice to this complex

work. But combined with the extended analyses of the Coleman data later performed by the Commission on Civil Rights, a few generalizations can be ventured about Negro academic achievement in public schools.

Two basic correlates of achievement emerge from the Coleman data: "home background of the child" and "student body quality of the school." Though each of these factors are measured in the report by a number of indicators, both basically involve social class differences and are effectively represented by parents' education. Home background can be tapped by the average of the parents' education of each student; and student body quality can be rated by the education of the parents of all of the students comprising a particular school. Measured in this manner, it is perhaps more accurate to speak of these two major correlates as individual social class and school social class.

The individual social class factor is often said to be the principal correlate of achievement in the Coleman study, but this flat statement requires qualification. Individual social class proved a more important predictor of test scores for white than Negro children.[3] And it proved of declining importance from the sixth to the twelfth grades.[4] As shown in considerable research on adolescents in American society, the influence of the family recedes as the influence of peers strengthens. Consequently, the school social class variable becomes particularly powerful in secondary education; and it is a far more important correlate of Negro than white achievement.

These trends can be detailed with data from the metropolitan Northeast. By the twelfth grade, lower-status Negro children attending

higher-status schools perform as a group slightly better than higher-status Negro children in lower-status schools.[5] Combining the two variables for the scores of these children, their verbal achievement averages range from slightly below an eighth-grade level for low-status students in lower-status schools to almost an eleventh-grade level for high-status students in higher-status schools - a decisive difference of three full grades.[6]

School social class, then, is easily the most important school correlate of achievement scores, white as well as Negro, although Coleman also looked closely at teacher ability and school facility variables. Teacher variables - ranging from years of teaching experience to years of formal education and vocabulary test score of the teacher - prove important, however. In similar ways to the school social class factor, the teacher factor is a stronger correlate of Negro than white student verbal achievement scores and is much more powerful in the secondary than elementary years.[7]

By contrast, school facilities do not relate highly to pupil performance. Once individual social class is controlled, for example, per pupil instructional expenditure in grades six, nine, and twelve is not significantly associated with achievement save in one notable case of marked extremes - Negro children in the South.[8] Nor do such variables as pupil-teacher ratio, library volumes, laboratories, number of extracurricular activities, comprehensiveness of the curriculum, strictness of promotion, ability grouping, and school size reveal any important and consistent relationships with achievement.[9] These essentially negative findings concerning the influence of school facilities have received great attention

and have apparently threatened many educators who ponder what chances for success their next school facilities bond referendum will have. Much of this concern, however, is caused by a misreading of these results. The chief finding is that school social class is such a critical achievement correlate that with a gross survey approach it will simply overwhelm any smaller school effects.

Moreover, the Coleman data do not mean that school facilities are unimportant. What they do signify is that the range of facilities now found in the nation's public schools is not great enough to explain wide differences in student performance. Consider the pupil-teacher ratio variable. Most American classrooms range between twenty and forty students per teacher. Within this relatively narrow range, Coleman could not show any consistent relationships with achievement scores. Yet one can still reasonably argue that it makes a major difference whether one is teaching five or 500 students; but Coleman could not test this proposition since actual pupil-teacher ratios of five and 500 are virtually non-existent. In short, Coleman could only test the effects of variables as they range in present-day schools. Just where below twenty and above forty pupils-per-teacher the instructional ratio variable becomes crucial for student performance must await more detailed, experimental studies.

II. Racial Composition of the Classroom and Negro Achievement

A key finding of the Coleman Report, then, and one of special importance for this paper and Conference is that the most significant school correlate of achievement test scores of all types of children is the social class climate of the school's student body. Measured by the social class origins of all of a school's students, this variable appears

most critical in the later grades and somewhat more important for Negro than white children. Put bluntly, children of all backgrounds tend to do better in schools with a predominantly middle-class milieu; and this trend is especially true in the later grades where the full force of peer-group influence is felt. This basic result of the Coleman Report has been vigorously challenged by a number of methodological critics, none of whom seem aware that the identical finding has been obtained by four other studies which employed sharply different measures and samples from those used by Coleman.[10]

The racial significance of this fundamental aspect of the Coleman Report becomes obvious as soon as we recall that only about one-fourth at most of the Negro American population can be accurately described as "middle-class." [11] Apart from strictly racial factors, then, extensive desegregation is necessary to provide Negro pupils with predominantly middle-class school settings. On these class grounds alone, Negro children in interracial classrooms would be expected to achieve more than similar Negro children in all-Negro classrooms, and these expectations are supported in the Coleman data. Negro children from "more than half" white classrooms score higher on both reading and mathematical achievement tests than other Negro children; and this effect is strongest among those who began their interracial schooling in the early grades.[12] In addition, Negro students in "more than half" white classrooms yield as a group higher standard deviations in test scores than Negroes in classrooms with fewer whites - that is, their scores deviate more widely from the group average. [13]

But are these achievement benefits of the interracial classroom completely a function of the school social class factor? Or are racial composition factors independently related in addition? The text of the Coleman Report is equivocal on this point; it speaks of the desegregation effect being"...largely, perhaps wholly, related to ...," or "...largely accounted for by...," other student body characteristics.[14] The Civil Rights Commission's re-analysis of these data, however, focuses further attention upon this particular question and finds that there is indeed a critical racial composition correlate. The re-analysis uncovers relatively large and consistent differences in favor of those twelfth-grade Negroes who are in "more than half" white classrooms even after the two major factors of the Coleman analysis have been controlled - family social class and school social class.[15] The most relevant chart is published on page 90 of Racial Isolation in the Public Schools showing the verbal achievement scores of twelfth-grade Negro children in the metropolitan Northeast (the only region with enough Negro children in both segregated and desegregated classrooms to furnish meaningful comparisons). Since this chart presents, perhaps, the most critical data of the entire report, it is reproduced here.

Observe several major trends. First, both social class and racial composition of the school are importantly related to the verbal scores. The differences at the extremes for twelfth-graders represent roughly three grade levels of achievement - a most significant contrast. Thus, students in lower social class schools with no white classmates attain only a seventh-grade standing (note bars 1 and 9) compared with nine-and-a-

half to ten-and-a-half grade standings for those in higher social class schools with "more than half" white classmates (note bars 8 and 16). Second, within the same student and school social class clusters, the proportion of white classmates still makes a marked difference at the extremes of from one to one-and-a-half grade levels (compare bars 1 with 4, 5 with 8, 9 with 12, and 13 with 16). Third, these apparent benefits for Negro achievement of interracial classrooms are not linear; that is, the test scores do not gradually increase as the percentage of white students increases. Note that Negroes in predominantly-white classrooms score sharply higher than others in each of the four comparisons, but those in classrooms with "less than half" whites tend to do no better than those in all-Negro classrooms. We shall return to this important fact later.

Further aspects of the Commission's re-analysis of the Coleman data extend these results. The importance of interracial education in the primary grades is borne out at numerous points in the Coleman and Commission Reports. The improved Negro academic performance under desegregation, for instance, appears greatest for those Negro children who begin their biracial training in the early grades. Controlling again for both individual and school social class, those ninth-grade Negro children in the metropolitan Northeast who had been in interracial classrooms in the first three grades consistently scored from a half to a full grade above comparable students.[16] (See the reproduced figure taken from the Commission Report at page 107). As the Commission Report made amply clear, the results of the critical chart on page 90 of the Report are not easily interpreted. A number of explanations can be offered for these findings which maintain that racial composition of the classroom itself is not the crucial variable, but

rather other factors which co-vary with racial composition are crucial. Each of these explanations deserves examination. Thus, it could be maintained that even in the metropolitan Northeast predominantly-Negro and predominantly-white schools vary sharply in school quality, especially teacher quality, and that it is these quality distinctions that are responsible for the improved scores in predominantly-white institutions. This argument could be challenged by the failure of the Coleman study to uncover sharp quality differences between "Negro" and "white" schools in the metropolitan Northeast; but this Coleman finding can itself be questioned.[17] In any event, school quality controls narrow slightly the performance differentials attributable to desegregation, but do not by any means exhaust them.[18]

A second type of explanation involves possible selection biases. One special form of the selection argument involves ability grouping. It can be argued that all the Commission found was that schools in the metropolitan Northeast do a reliable and accurate job of placing Negro students in ability groups or "tracks." Given the social handicaps many Negro children bring to the school situation, goes the argument, only the very brightest do well; and these gifted Negro children eventually are assigned to high-ability groups where most of their classmates are white. But less exceptional Negro students will find themselves assigned to low- or medium-ability groups where many or most of their classmates are other Negroes. Consequently, those Negroes with mostly white classmates score highest on academic achievement tests simply because they were brighter to begin with.

Another form of the selection explanation concerns parental choice of community and school. It maintains that within a given social class group more ambitious Negro parents will somehow manage to live in communities with interracial schools. Thus, what appears to be an advantage wrought by interracial schools is actually a result of the self-recruitment of especially motivated children of educationally-minded Negro parents within each Negro social class. A third possible selection argument involving relatively more drop-outs of poorly achieving Negro students from predominantly-white schools is not viable here, because the Commission results can be replicated on ninth-graders before the vast majority of present-day drop-outs have occurred.

These selection explanations receive some empirical support from Wilson's research in Richmond, California conducted for the Commission.[19] He found that "...Negro students who attended integrated schools had higher mental maturity test scores in their primary grades, and came from homes better provided with educative materials."[20] Thus, when Wilson held constant the early elementary achievement of these students, he found that the school class effect remained but that "the racial composition of schools, while tending to favor Negro students in integrated schools, does not have a substantial effect." [21]

Wilson's conclusion is limited, however, in four ways. First, it applies to schools, not classrooms - the principal unit of the Commission's analysis. This is not an unimportant distinction, of course, since formally desegregated schools often have largely segregated classes within them. Second, unlike the Coleman data, the number of Negro students in desegregated

schools in Wilson's study of Richmond, California is quite small. The eighth-grade verbal reasoning test data, for example, are available for only 128 Negro children in predominantly-white schools compared with 777 Negro children in predominantly-Negro schools.[23] Third, among these 128 desegregated eighth-graders, only 8 of them (6%) were in lower-status schools; but among the 777 segregated eighth-graders, 378 of them (49%) were in lower-status schools. In other words, there is not enough variance in school social class among desegregated eighth-graders for Wilson's statistical procedures to separate out the school social class and racial composition factors convincingly. Likewise, four, another type of Negro child critical to Wilson's analysis is in especially short supply. While he has Negro students with both high and low test scores when they entered segregated primary schools and others with high test scores when they entered desegregated schools, he lacks many examples of Negro children with <u>low</u> test scores when they entered <u>desegregated</u> primary schools. This missing group is the most crucial of all for analytical and practical purposes.

Since the Wilson study leaves open the question about the effects of desegregation upon the more disadvantaged Negro students, the Commission employed Coleman data to check on the effects of interracial classrooms on the verbal scores of less gifted Negro ninth-graders in the metropolitan Northeast.[23] These students had poorly educated parents and reported themselves to be in low- or medium-ability tracks. Both in high and low status high schools, these Negroes who were from predominantly-white classrooms performed on the average from one-half to two-thirds of a grade better than comparable Negroes from predominantly-Negro classrooms.

The ability grouping argument is directed at the finding that predominantly-white classrooms are associated with higher Negro scores. But it does not address itself to the additional finding that multiple tracked, predominantly-white schools also tend to relate to higher Negro performance. More importantly, the ability grouping contentions lose force from the time sequence involved. Recall that the largest effects of interracial classrooms occur when the experience begins in the earliest elementary grades. Yet ability grouping does not typically begin in American public schools until the middle school grades and does not become nearly universal until the high school grades. Therefore, desegregation would appear to afford a better explanation for who gets into the high-ability tracks than ability tracks do for desegregation effects. A Negro child of medium ability who begins his education in a desegregated school, for instance, has a far higher probability of being selected later for a high ability track than a Negro child of comparable ability going to a school of similar social status who began his education in an all-Negro school. Ability grouping, then, can serve as a magnifier of the differences already begun by classroom differences in racial composition, a catalyst adding to the cumulative deficits of the segregated Negro.

The parental choice of community and school idea is in some ways the reverse of the ability grouping contention. It aims to account for the fact that predominantly-white communities and schools are associated with higher Negro achievement; but it cannot fully account for the fact that the Commission shows interracial classrooms are also associated with higher Negro achievement - unless one is willing to assume that there is widespread

selection by Negro parents of classrooms as well as communities and schools. There are other assumptions, too, that this particular line of reasoning must make that are at best dubious. Since lower-status, low-ability Negro pupils also benefit from desegregation, these contentions require that poor Negro families possess a sophisticated knowledge of where to go to find the better interracial schools and the funds and freedom of mobility to move accordingly. All that is known about the extreme residential discrimination practiced against Negroes, especially poor Negroes, in American metropolitan areas today make such assumptions most improbable.[24]

Two additional explanations argue that at least some of the apparent racial composition effect revealed by the Commission's re-analysis still reflects the operation of the powerful school social class effect. One chain of reasoning is based on the difficulty of controlling for social class across racial groups. Since the floor of Negro deprivation is below that of whites, for example, it can be maintained that "lower class" Negroes who attend a predominantly-white school comprised largely of "lower class" whites are still benefiting from a higher social class student climate than "lower class" Negroes who attend a predominantly-Negro school comprised of "lower class" Negroes. While there is some merit in this reasoning, it should be remembered that the Commission's differences for twelfth-graders by racial composition of classrooms (averaging about one-and-a-third grades holding the two class variables constant) were approximately 80% as large as those attributable to school social class directly (averaging about one-and-two-thirds grades holding the individual social class and racial composition variables constant). Hence, it would seem that the small school

class residual under discussion could account for only a small portion of the racial composition effect.

The other class explanation is limited, but, perhaps, the most subtle of all. It applies only to certain lower-status Negro students who attend predominantly-white, lower-status schools. Even if the lower-status Negro child is of fully equivalent status to that of the whites, he might well benefit from membership in a minority comprised largely of middle-class Negroes. This possibility is not as remote as it may sound, for a larger percentage of middle-class than lower-class Negroes attend predominantly-white schools and the argument assumes only that the Negro minority will serve as a more positive and salient reference group than the white majority. Though of limited scope, this ingenious possibility elegantly illustrates the subtleties and difficulties inherent in this type of research.

None of these counter explanations, taken singly or together, appears to eliminate the relatively large relationship found by the Commission between the racial composition of the classroom and Negro test performance. This means that while the social class composition of the school remains the dominant factor, there is in addition a significant contribution of the interracial classroom upon the Negro child's academic achievement. The lengthy discussion to reach this conclusion had two purposes. One was to illustrate in depth the operation of many of the special problems of interpreting race and education survey research results. A second reason for this discussion is that the issue is in fact of vital theoretical and practical significance. While it is not critical for determining the need

for desegregated schools, it is crucial for determining the actual processes through which desegregation affects both Negro and white children. If it is merely a school social class effect, that fact limits our search to non-racial processes that should not be unique to interracial schools. If, however, there is also a racial composition effect, then our net must be cast wider to include specifically racial considerations. The writer believes the evidence at this point. It points to the operation of both social class and racial composition factors; and that this heightens the importance of the considerations stressed in the paper written for this conference by Professor Irwin Katz.

III. Useful Definitions of "Segregation," "Desegregation," and "Integration"

The Coleman and Civil Rights Commission results strongly suggest some empirically-based definitional distinctions that could prove clarifying to this semantically confused realm. To begin with, the legal distinctions between de jure and de facto segregation is of no practical importance for the consequences of racial isolation in the schools. The Commission's data speak to this issue directly; they suggest effects of de facto school segregation just as negative as those reported earlier for de jure school segregation. The legal distinction has little relevance for the Negro child in the all-Negro school.

Indeed, a realistic look at so-called de facto school segregation in cities today calls into question even the legal separation of the two forms of segregation. While de jure apartheid has its roots in blatant state legislation, so-called "de facto" apartheid generally has its roots in state action, too. Such state action may include anything from school

board decisions to urban renewal plans and zoning ordinances. At some future time in American history, as Paul Freund has suggested, the judiciary will have to come to terms with the implications of the state action similarity between de jure and de facto forms of school segregation.

The Coleman and Commission data also have implications for the question of numbers and percentages. Two major alternatives had been previously proposed. One manner of defining "segregation" and "desegregation" is to peg the definition to the non-white percentage of the area's over-all school population. Thus, if twelve per cent of a system's students are non-white, then ideally each school in the system would approach a non-white student composition of twelve per cent. There are at least two criticisms of this approach: it is often impractical in all but reasonably small areas; and it treats the individual school as a simple reflection of the community, rather than an integumented institution with its own dynamics and requirements.

A second definition of a racially desegregated school attempts to meet these criticisms with a relatively fixed, rather than variable, gauge. On the basis of several social psychological considerations, the ideally desegregated school is one whose student body includes from roughly 20 to 45 per cent non-whites. The disadvantage here is that uniracial schools could still result in systems with fewer than 20 per cent or more than 45 per cent non-white children. The federal studies suggest a simpler set of definitions: a segregated school is one whose student body is predominantly non-white; while a desegregated school is one whose student body

is interracial but predominantly white. Such definitions stem from the previously mentioned finding that the beneficial effects of interracial schools for the academic performance of Negro children are not linear; that is, Negro test scores do not rise evenly with increasing percentages of white children in the classroom. Rather, both the Coleman and Commission analyses point to a discontinuity at just past the mid-point with the highest Negro verbal test scores reported from "more than half" white classrooms.[25] Indeed, enrollment in classes with "less than half" whites is associated with scores not significantly different from those all-Negro classrooms.

These simpler definitions receive further support from white test performance. Dr. David Cohen's paper for the Conference treats this issue in detail. Suffice it here to note that, as long as the class is predominantly-white, the achievement levels of white pupils in inter-racial classrooms do not differ from those of white pupils in all-white classrooms.[26] But attendance in predominantly-Negro classes is associated with lower white test scores. In other words, the same classes relate to higher scores for both Negro and white children; and these classrooms are predominantly-white and may usefully be defined as "desegregated." Similarly, the same classes relate to lower scores for both Negro and white children; and these classrooms are predominantly-Negro and may usefully be defined as "segregated."

The ideological difficulties of such definitions are readily apparent. As mentioned before, Negroes can righfully argue that such definitions imply that "white is right," that predominantly-Negro schools cannot be

"good schools." Commissioner Frankie Freeman of the Civil Rights Commission addressed herself specifically to this issue in a supplementary statement to the Commission report:

> "The question is not whether in theory or in the abstract Negro schools can be as good as white schools. In a society free from prejudice in which Negroes were full and equal participants, the answer would clearly be "Yes." But we are forced, rather, to ask the harder question, whether in our present society, where Negroes are a minority which has been discriminated against, Negro children can prepare themselves to participate effectively in society if they grow up and go to school in isolation from the majority group. We must also ask whether we can cure the disease of prejudice and prepare all children for life in a multiracial world if white children grow up and go to school in isolation from Negroes." [27]

The two federal reports also suggest that another useful distinction can and should be made between "desegregated" and "integrated" schools. Note that the definition of desegregation involves only a specification of the racial mix of students - namely, more than half whites. It does not include any description of the quality of the interracial contact. Merely desegregated schools can be either effective or ineffective, can boast genuine interracial acceptance or intense interracial hostility. In short, a desegregated school is not necessarily a "good school."

Recall that the Coleman Report revealed consistently larger standard deviations for the test scores of Negro children in desegregated (i.e., "more than half" white) classrooms.[28] Many of these children are doing extremely well, but others are not doing nearly as well. What accounts for these wide differences? The Commission's re-analysis of these Coleman data suggests that the explanatory intervening variable is <u>interracial acceptance</u>. In desegregated schools where most teachers report no tension, Negro students evince higher verbal achievement, more definite college plans, and more positive attitudes than students in tense desegregated schools.[29] White students also evince benefits from the interracially harmonious school. Professor Katz's paper for this conference sheds further illumination on this process.

The term "integrated school", then, might usefully be reserved for the desegregated school where interracial acceptance is the norm. With these usages, "desegregation" becomes the prerequisite, but "integration" is the ultimate goal.

IV. The Non-Academic Consequences of Interracial Education

While important, high achievement test scores are surely not the only goal of education. Indeed, many advocates argue for integrated education solely in terms of the non-academic benefits of diverse contacts. Preparation for the interracial world of the future, they insist, demands interracial schools today for both white and Negro youth. The Coleman and Commission data speak to this issue, too.

The Coleman Report itself shows that white students who attend public schools with Negroes are the least likely to prefer all-white classrooms and all-white "close friends"; and this effect, too, is strongest among those who begin their interracial schooling in the early grades.[30] Consistent with these results are data from Louisville, Kentucky on Negro pupils. In an open choice situation, Negro children are likely to select predominantly-white high schools only if they are currently attending predominantly-white junior high schools.[31] In short, integration leads to a preference among both white and Negro children for integration, while segregation breeds further segregation.

A Civil Rights Commission survey of urban adults in the North and West discussed in the Report suggests that these trends continue into adulthood. Negro adults who themselves attended desegregated schools as children tend to be more eager to have their children attend such schools and do in fact more often send their children to such schools than comparable Negro adults who attended only segregated schools as children.[32] They are typically making more money and more frequently in white-collar occupations

than previously-segregated Negroes of comparable origins. Similarly, white adults who experienced as children integrated schooling differ from comparable whites in their greater willingness to reside in an interracial neighborhood, to have their children attend interracial schools, and to have Negro friends.[33] Thus, the cumulative nature of integration is not limited to just the school career of the child, but tends to span generations.

The consistency of these results and their practical importance commend further and more detailed work in this area. Longitudinal research and more sensitive methods than crude surveys seem indicated. Such future work could give us a clearer conception of the process by which these effects are generated. One hint as to a mediating mechanism appears in the Commission's analysis: namely, many of the attitude and behavioral consequences appeared to be mediated by cross-racial friendship. Consistent with the findings and ideas expressed earlier about a truly integrated school, many of the adult results were greatly enhanced if the respondent had had interracial schooling and a close friend of the other race. Those who had received a desegregated education but who had not had a close friend often showed few if any positive effects. To sum up, it appears that integrated schools do in fact prepare their Negro and white products for interracial living as adults.

In addition to improved interracial attitudes, an interesting personality benefit of the biracial classroom emerges in Coleman's data which in turn is directly connected with academic performance. Student personality variables are surprisingly strong independent correlates

of test performance in Coleman's data for all groups of children, though different measures predict white and Negro achievement. An "academic self-concept" variable -- measured by such items as "How bright do you think you are in comparison with the other students in your grade?" -- proves more significant for white performance. But a brief scale of "fate control" -- indicated, for example, by disagreeing that "Good luck is more important than hard work for success" -- is much more important for Negro performance. The critical point is that this sense of fate control among Negroes tends to be greater in desegregated schools.

Clearly, these personality-achievement findings result from tapping into a complex process involving a two-way causal pattern. Not only do those Negro children with a sense of fate control subsequently do better in their school achievement, but those who do well in school achievement undoubtedly begin to gain a sense of fate control. Nevertheless, it is tempting to speculate with Coleman that each child faces a two-stage problem: first, he must learn that he can within reasonably broad limits act effectively upon his surroundings; and, second, he must then evaluate his own relative capabilities for mastering the environment. The critical stage for white children seems to be the second stage concerning the self-concept, while the critical stage for Negro children seems realistically enough to involve the question of manipulating an often harsh and over-powering environment. In any event, more detailed experimental work along these lines appears warranted.

V. <u>Is Compensatory Education in Segregated Schools an Effective Substitute for Integrated Education</u>?

Since the initiation of the much-touted "Higher Horizons" project in New York City and similar early programs elsewhere, so-called "compensatory

education" has been put forward as an effective alternative to racially-integrated education. Now the roughly billion-and-a-half dollars annually invested by the Federal Government into this type of strategy through Title I of the 1965 Elementary and Secondary Education Act makes this alternative even more attractive and widespread. Moreover, it is politically expedient, for it solves -- temporarily, at any rate -- a real dilemma many school superintendents and boards of education in urban districts face: on the one hand, one must act to change the incredibly-ineffective education of impoverished Negroes that has been occurring for years; but, on the other hand, racial desegregation of public schools is often a controversial and stoutly-resisted action. Compensatory programs allow one to act and to avoid controversy -- especially if Federal funds pay the bill.

There is only one difficulty with this "solution": there is no solid evidence that it works. Indeed, there is mounting evidence from throughout the nation that it resoundingly fails. This is not to say that these enthusiastically-initiated programs do not improve for a time the tenor of many ghetto schools -- not an unimportant achievement. But it is to say that it remains to be demonstrated that these programs can lead to lasting and significant academic gains. So far the record of these programs is not encouraging.

To account for repeated failures in this realm, one need only recall the chief finding of the Coleman Report: the principal resource a school can offer a disadvantaged child is close association with advantaged children. As we have seen, a major reason why integration leads to lasting significant academic gains for Negro children seems to be the association

with middle-class children that it often provides for working-class Negro children. Compensatory programs for disadvantaged youngsters without such contact are, to put it mildly, struggling uphill to achieve meaningful effects with mere curriculum changes under the same isolated conditions as before. One may speculate if this is not one of the reasons for the Coleman Report's unpopularity in some quarters. Striking as it does at the heart of a politically-expedient strategy which is supported by a billion-and-a-half dollars, the Report understandably, perhaps, has been suppressed and irresponsibly criticized. Released late on a rainy Saturday afternoon of a July 4th weekend, the Coleman Report is now out of print and one is cheerfully told by both the U.S. Government Printing Office and the U.S. Office of Education that it will not be reissued.

The Commission Report explores this crucial area further. Though widely misinterpreted as attacking "compensatory education" in general, the Commission expressed skepticism over the efficacy of such programs in ghetto schools. It came to this conclusion after studying in detail such programs in St. Louis, New York City, Syracuse, Philadelphia, Berkeley, and Seattle (see chapter 4 of Racial Isolation in the Public Schools, Volume I).[34] It noted with interest that comparable Negro children in the last four cities who were bussed out to predominantly-white schools did show sustained academic gains, whereas those who had remained behind in the ghetto schools for special programs did not.

The Commission's conclusion is obvious: Why not have both integration and remedial education as needed? Of course, the two intervention strategies are often pitted against one another as either-or alternatives, since realistically they compete for the same funds, have rival educational

ideologies undergirding them, and have different political constituencies. These are political reasons why we do not combine them; in educational terms, there is every reason to coordinate both measures into a single strategy.

Finally, it should be said in fairness that the general failure of ghetto compensatory programs to date does not necessarily mean failure of future and radically different programs. One cannot evaluate a program yet to be tried. It is the responsibility, however, of those who honestly believe that compensatory education can in fact be a viable alternative to racial integration to reject the null hypothesis with rigorous data; that is, the advocates have the burden of proof that it can yet be accomplished.

VI. Practical Implications

By way of recapitulation, the following practical considerations for educational policy can be deduced from the material reviewed in this paper:

(1) Careful attention to the "social class" mix of school student bodies is indicated, for children of all regions, groups, and classes tend to academically perform best in schools characterized by a middle-class milieu.

(2) Teacher quality, but not the typical range of school facilities, relates to student achievement. Special attention to upgrading a system's teachers seems justified, especially in the verbal achievement domain.

(3) Racial composition of the school and classroom is important for academic, attitude, and personality reasons; and it operates in addition as well as in concert with the more powerful school social class factor.

(4) In terms of the achievement consequences for both white and Negro children, it is useful to define a "segregated" school as one that is predominantly Negro, a "desegregated" school as one that is interracial but predominantly white, and an "integrated" school as one that boasts both desegregation and cross-racial acceptance and friendship. Valuable means of moving from a merely desegregated school to an integrated one are discussed in Professor Katz's paper for this Conference.

(5) The academic and attitude benefits of integrated education for children of both races are maximized when they begin their interracial experience in the earliest primary grades. It is, of course, politically most difficult to desegregate the elementary level; but it is also true that it is most difficult to achieve real integration -- as opposed to desegregation -- when the biracial contact begins at the junior high and, particularly, the high school levels.

(6) On the basis of the record of the many popular attempts to date, it does not appear that so-called "compensatory" education in segregated schools is an effective substitute for integrated education. While these programs generally represent an improvement in school morale and climate, they have not led to lasting academic improvement of Negro student achievement. When at all politically and financially feasible, the most attractive possibility is to combine such programs with school desegregation.

FOOTNOTES

1/ U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, Racial Isolation in the Public Schools, Volume I and II, Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1967. Hereafter footnoted as "CCR, I or II."

2/ Coleman, J.S., Campbell, E.Q., Hobson, C.J. , McPartland, J., Mood, A.M., Weinfeld, F.D., & York, R.L. Equality of Educational Opportunity. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1966 (No. OE-38001). Hereafter footnoted as "Coleman."

3/ Coleman, P. 300. Replicated by Wilson in his work in Richmond, California; See: CCR, II, pp. 165-206.

4/ Coleman, p. 300.

5/ CCR, I, p. 85.

6/ CCR, I, p. 85.

7/ Coleman, pp. 316-317.

8/ Coleman, pp. 312-313.

9/ Coleman, pp. 312-316.

10/ Cleveland, Stuart, A tardy look at Stouffer's findings in the Harvard mobility project. Public Opinion Quarterly, 1962, 26, 453-454; Michael, J.A. High school climates and plans for entering college. Public Opinion Quarterly, 1961, 25, 585-595; Wilson, A.B. Residential segregation of social classes and aspirations of high school boys. American Sociological Review, 1959, 24, 836-845; and Wilson, A.B. Educational consequences of segregation in a California community. In: CCR, II, pp. 165-206. The first three of these studies were conducted prior to the Coleman study. The fourth, completed since the Coleman work, replicates the basic

school social class finding in a research design that is longitudinal and controls for achievement levels upon entering school. These additional components are important safeguards, for some critics of the Coleman result claimed it to be merely a methodological artifact of a research design without these features.

11/ This crude estimate derives from three modest and measurable definitions of "middle class": approximately one-quarter of adult Negroes are high school graduates; slightly more than one-fifth of Negroes in the labor force have white-collar occupations; and about one-quarter of Negro families have an annual income in excess of $6,000.

12/ Coleman, p. 332.

13/ Coleman, p. 333. The scores of the few Negroes with all white classmates have the highest standard deviations of all, though smaller cell sizes obscure the interpretation of this result.

14/ Coleman, pp. 307, 330.

15/ CCR, I, p. 90.

16/ CCR, I, p. 107.

17/ CCR, I, p. 94.

18/ CCR, I, pp. 98-100. Recall, too, that school facilities as such did not prove to be closely related to achievement in these Coleman data. Only teacher quality predicted well among "quality variables," and this factor was therefore controlled in the Commission re-analysis.

19/ CCR, I, pp. 100-101.

20/ CCR, I, p. 100.

21/ CCR, I, p. 101.

22/ CCR, II, p. 185 (Table 23).

23/ CCR, I, p. 101.

24/ Karl Taeuber and Alma Taeuber, Negroes in Cities. Chicago, Ill: Aldims, 1965.

25/ Coleman, p. 332; CCR, I, p. 90.

26/ CCR, I, p. 160.

27/ CCR, I, p. 214.

28/ Coleman, p. 333.

29/ CCR, I, pp. 157-158.

30/ Coleman, p. 333.

31/ U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, Civil Rights USA: Public Schools, Southern States, 1962. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1963.

32/ CCR, I, pp. 111-113.

33/ CCR, I, pp. 111-113.

34/ For a more recent example of vast claims made for a compensatory program and the realistic evidence, see the following exchanges concerning the more effective school program of New York City: Joseph Alsop, "No More Nonsense About Ghetto Education!" The New Republic, July 22, 1967, 157, 18-23; and Robert Schwartz, Thomas Pettigrew, and Marshall Smith, "Fake Panaceas for Ghetto Education," The New Republic, September 23, 1967, 157, 16-19.